

1 PAUL B. SNYDER  
2 United States Bankruptcy Judge  
3 1717 Pacific Ave, Suite 2209  
4 Tacoma, WA 98402

✓ FILED  
— LODGED  
— RECEIVED

5 **January 12, 2006**

6 MARK L. HATCHER  
7 CLERK U.S. BANKRUPTCY COURT  
8 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
9 AT TACOMA  
10 \_\_\_\_\_DEPUTY

11 **UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT**  
12 **WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA**

13 In re:

Case No. 04-40732

14 ROY JAMES MURPHY, JR. and  
15 ELIZABETH JEAN MURPHY,

16 Debtors.

**MEMORANDUM DECISION**

17 **NOT FOR PUBLICATION**

18 THIS MATTER came before the Court on Roy James Murphy, Jr. and Elizabeth  
19 Murphy's (Debtors) Motion to Sell Property (Motion). Based on the pleadings and arguments  
20 presented, the Court makes the following findings of fact and conclusions of law.

21 **FINDINGS OF FACT**

22 The Debtors filed a voluntary Chapter 13 petition on January 28, 2004. The Debtors'  
23 Chapter 13 Plan (Plan) was confirmed on April 21, 2004. The confirmed Plan is a best efforts  
24 plan with a proposed dividend of 0% to unsecured. The Plan payment is \$243 per month.  
25 The Plan provides in paragraph 3.C for first mortgage arrears owed to Midland Mortgage  
Company (Midland) of \$10,000 to be paid by the Chapter 13 Trustee (Trustee) from all  
available funds after payment of administrative expenses.

1 The mortgage arrears claim of Midland is on the Debtors' residential real property  
2 located at 1803 Southwest 2nd Avenue, Battle Ground, Washington (Property). Midland is  
3 the holder of a note and deed of trust on the Property. The approximate balance owing to  
4 Midland is \$150,000. The Debtors' Plan was confirmed and the Debtors were permitted,  
5 without objection, to pay the current mortgage payment to Midland outside of the Plan.

6 The Debtors entered into an agreement postconfirmation to sell the Property for  
7 \$222,500. The Debtors filed a motion to sell the Property on November 30, 2005. Under the  
8 Debtors' proposal, a portion of the proceeds would be distributed to the Trustee to pay off all  
9 remaining unsecured claims in full, plus administrative expenses. All remaining secured  
10 claims, specifically, the Midland claim would be paid through escrow at closing.

11 The Trustee objected to the Motion arguing that the Debtors are bound by the  
12 confirmed Plan and that modification of the Plan is necessary to pay the Midland arrearage  
13 claim directly from escrow. The Trustee argues, however, that modification is impermissible  
14 in a case such as this where the sole purpose of the modification is to avoid the Trustee's  
15 statutory fee. Under In re Fulkrod, 973 F.2d 801 (9th Cir. 1992), the Trustee argues that the  
16 arrearage claim is an impaired claim that must be paid through the Plan.

17 The Debtors in this case have not filed a formal motion to modify their confirmed Plan.  
18 At the December 6, 2005 hearing, however, the Court heard argument regarding the Debtors'  
19 Motion in conjunction with a similar motion filed in the unrelated bankruptcy case of  
20 Dethpaskouk and Noi Saysouthep (Bankr. Case. No. 04-51852). At that hearing, the parties  
21 framed the issues to be decided by the Court in both cases as follows: (1) is modification of a  
22 chapter 13 plan necessary to pay an arrearage claim directly from escrow, and (2) can a plan  
23 be modified in order to pay the arrearage through escrow without paying the Trustee a  
24  
25

1 statutory fee. The Court will address both of these issues in its decision as they were argued  
2 by both parties and are necessary to completely resolve this matter.

3 On December 7, 2005, the Court entered an Order Authorizing the Debtors to Sell Real  
4 Property, but reserved the issue of modification and payment of the Trustee's fee.

### 5 **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

6 The primary issue raised by this Motion is whether the Debtors can pay the arrearage  
7 claim of Midland directly through escrow and thereby avoid the statutory Trustee fee, or  
8 whether they must be paid through the Plan.  
9

10 A debtor is bound by the terms of a confirmed plan. See 11 U.S.C. § 1327(a). Under  
11 the Debtors' confirmed Plan, the arrearage claim of Midland is specifically provided for and is  
12 to be paid by the Trustee. Therefore, but for the sale, which generated sufficient funds to pay  
13 the Plan in full, the Trustee would have paid the arrearage claim during the life of the Plan and  
14 received her statutory fee. As the Debtors are seeking to provide different treatment for the  
15 arrearage claim than required by their confirmed Plan, the Trustee is correct that modification  
16 of the Plan is necessary.

17 Historically, both parties admit that the Trustee allowed a debtor to pay in full a  
18 mortgage arrears claim outside of a confirmed plan from the sale of property, without requiring  
19 a modification or paying the Trustee's statutory fee. Due to recent changes, however, in the  
20 real estate market and a sharp increase in the number of refinances, the Trustee has  
21 reexamined this policy. The Court understands the Trustee's concerns and the potential  
22 negative impact on her cashflow, however, the Court agrees with the Debtors that such  
23 concerns are insufficient to authorize her a fee to which she is not legally entitled.  
24  
25

1 A debtor has an absolute right under 11 U.S.C. § 1329 to seek modification of a  
2 confirmed plan. In re Sunahara, 326 B.R. 768, 782 (9th Cir. BAP 2005). In Sunahara, the  
3 Ninth Circuit Bankruptcy Appellate Panel recognized that a Chapter 13 debtor can modify a  
4 36-month plan to complete it in less than 36 months and receive an early discharge.  
5 Sunahara, 326 B.R. at 782. Further, 11 U.S.C. § 1329(a)(3) specifically provides that a plan  
6 may be modified to “alter the amount of the distribution to a creditor whose claim is provided  
7 for by the plan to the extent necessary to take account of any payment of such claim other  
8 than under the plan.” This is what the Debtors are seeking to accomplish. The Debtors would  
9 be modifying the Plan to pay it off in a lump sum and receive a discharge, while also  
10 modifying it to provide that the distribution to Midland on the arrearage claim would be paid  
11 outside the Plan.  
12

13 The Court disagrees that modification to provide direct payment through escrow is  
14 precluded by Fulkrod. In Fulkrod, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals held that the “bankruptcy  
15 code does not authorize a debtor to make payments directly to creditors with claims modified  
16 by a plan of reorganization in order to avoid paying the bankruptcy trustee the statutory fee  
17 under 28 U.S.C. § 586.” Fulkrod, 973 F.2d at 803. This ruling recognized the standing  
18 trustee’s central role in the administration of Chapter 12 cases and the fact that the  
19 bankruptcy system is entirely funded from the plan payments disbursed by the trustee.<sup>1</sup>  
20 Fulkrod, 973 F.2d at 802. The Ninth Circuit commented that in enacting 28 U.S.C. § 586 to  
21 authorize fees only on funds “received,” Congress could not have intended that a debtor  
22 would be able to avoid such fees by paying all impaired claims directly.  
23  
24  
25

---

<sup>1</sup>Although Fulkrod was a Chapter 12 case, as the relevant provisions in both chapters are the same, it has application to Chapter 13 cases as well.

1        Fulkrod and its line of cases stem from an amendment to 28 U.S.C. § 586(e)(2) in  
2 1986, to provide that the Chapter 12 or 13 trustee is only entitled to a fee on “all payments  
3 received by such individual under plans in the cases under chapter 12 or 13 of title 11 for  
4 which such individual serves as standing trustee.” 28 U.S.C. § 586(e)(2) (emphasis added).  
5 Prior to 1986, 28 U.S.C. § 586(e)(2), read that the trustee “shall collect such percentage fee  
6 from all payments under plans in the cases under this chapter for which such individual serves  
7 as standing trustee.” Former 28 U.S.C. § 586(e)(2) (Reform Act of 1978) (emphasis added).  
8 Under the former statute, there were conflicting decisions as to whether the Chapter 13  
9 trustee could collect a fee on payments made directly by a debtor. Lundin, Chapter 13  
10 Bankruptcy, § 64.4, p. 64-3 (3d ed. 2000 & Supp. 2004). The 1986 amendment made it clear  
11 that a trustee was not entitled to a fee on direct payments. The change in the statute created  
12 a significant incentive for debtors to propose direct payments, especially on large claims, such  
13 as home mortgages that would generate a substantial fee. Cases such as Fulkrod and In re  
14 Genereux, 137 B.R. 411 (Bankr. W.D. Wash. 1992) make clear that, at least in the Ninth  
15 Circuit, debtors cannot propose direct payment merely to avoid statutory trustee fees.

16  
17        Fulkrod and Genereux address a much different issue, however, than the case before  
18 the Court. In this case, the Debtors are not proposing to pay the mortgage arrears merely to  
19 avoid the statutory Trustee fee. Rather, the Debtors seek to have this claim disbursed directly  
20 from escrow because it is the most common, simplest, and a convenient way for parties to  
21 close a property sale and disburse the funds. As noted by the Debtors, if their request is  
22 denied, the escrow company would be required to disburse funds on the principal owed to  
23 Midland, for example, while the funds earmarked for Midland’s arrearage claim would be sent  
24 to the Trustee for disbursements. Such a process is both complicated and administratively  
25

unnecessary. The other option of allowing escrow to disburse the funds, but still allow the Trustee a statutory fee is not authorized under 28 U.S.C. § 586(e) because the Trustee never received the funds.

Further, a modification to pay a creditor directly from a lump sum amount that will result in termination of the case is different than a modification or proposal in a confirmed plan to pay a creditor directly on an impaired claim that will still require the Trustee's services for the duration of the Chapter 13 plan. In Genereux, for example, the bankruptcy court recognized the burden direct payment would place on the Trustee to monitor "potentially hundreds of debtors' direct payments." Genereux, 137 B.R. at 413. No further burden would be placed on the Trustee in this case because the Plan would be completed. In addition, although the number of refinances that result in Chapter 13 plan payoffs has recently increased, this is not a scenario that would arise in the majority of Chapter 13 cases. Therefore, unlike Fulkrod and Genereux, concerns regarding the impact on the Trustee's compensation in allowing direct payments outside the plan in a "large scale" is not as significant. Genereux, 137 B.R. at 413.

In addition, when a plan is paid in full from a sale of property, deduction of the usual trustee statutory fee from the proceeds could result in substantial overcompensation to the Trustee. See, e.g., In re Roberts, 226 B.R. 240 (Bankr. D. Id. 1998) (trustee not entitled to fee under 28 U.S.C. § 586(e)(2) for funds directly distributed to creditor from sale of collateral even though confirmed plan provided for payment of claim by periodic payments to be disbursed by the trustee and where original motion provided for fees). In this case, the Trustee receives her fee on the unsecured claims immediately rather than over the duration of the Plan. Although she loses a fee on the arrearage claim, her responsibilities in the case are

1 terminated. In addition, this was a zero percent Plan that will now pay unsecured 100%. The  
2 Trustee will therefore receive fees on unsecured claims that were never anticipated.

3 The possibility of inequitable results and overcompensation to the Trustee is evident  
4 from a scenario pointed out by the Debtors. The Trustee apparently now requires that  
5 current mortgage payments be made through the plan when there are mortgage arrears. If,  
6 for example, the Debtors in this case had also been required to pay the current mortgage  
7 payment through the Chapter 13 Plan, upon the refinance, the Trustee would presumably be  
8 entitled to a fee not only on the arrearage claim, but also on the projected mortgage payments  
9 over the remaining term of the Plan. The commission on such a claim could be substantial  
10 and may result in the Debtors not qualifying for a refinance. Allowance of such a fee would be  
11 inequitable when the Trustee only had to monitor the case for a short period of time. Although  
12 the Trustee has indicated that she would not seek a fee in such a case, it is not illogical to  
13 apply her arguments to this situation. With either an arrears claim or current mortgage  
14 payments, the Trustee will be deprived a fee that she would have received in the future if the  
15 Plan were not modified.  
16

17 In summary, the Debtors are able to modify their Plan to provide for direct payment on  
18 the Midland arrearage claim by escrow and the Chapter 13 Trustee is not entitled to any  
19 compensation on disbursements from escrow under 28 U.S.C. § 586(e), because the  
20 payments were never "received." Modification of the Plan is necessary because the  
21 confirmed Plan provided for different treatment of these claims. Additionally, under Sunahara,  
22 326 B.R. at 781-82, a Chapter 13 trustee would normally be entitled to object to a modification  
23 as not being proposed in good faith if, for example, the debtors were not paying unsecured  
24  
25

1 claims in full. In this and similar cases, however, modification may often be only a technicality  
2 where unsecured claims will be paid in full.

3 DATED: January 12, 2006

4  
5 

6 Paul B. Snyder  
7 U.S. Bankruptcy Judge

8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13 NOT FOR PUBLICATION  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25